

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/001,849 11/19/2001		11/19/2001	Jonathan J. Hull	015358-007300US	3259	
20350	350 7590 09/20/2006			EXAMINER		
		TOWNSEND AND ROCENTER	BAUTISTA, XIOMARA L			
EIGHTH FL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SAN FRANC	CISCO, C	CA 94111-3834	2179			

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			ation No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)				
			10/001,849 HULL ET AL.						
	Office Action Summary	Exami	ier	Art Unit					
		X. L. Ba	utista	2179					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on	the cover sheet with th	he correspondence a	ddress				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR I CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILI nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica o period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, b reply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF CFR 1.136(a). In no tion. period will apply an y statute, cause the	THIS COMMUNICAT event, however, may a reply be d will expire SIX (6) MONTHS application to become ABAND	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	23 August 20	06.						
• ==		This action is							
′=									
٠,۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims	·	•						
4)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 18-33</u> is/are pending in the application.								
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	☐ Claim(s) is are anowed. ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 18-33</u> is/are rejected.								
	_								
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election	ı requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers								
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer							
· ·	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[b) objected to by the	he Examiner					
	Applicant may not request that any objection	•							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the		· ·	• •	CFR 1.121(d).				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by		- · · ·	•	• •				
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	oreign priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	9(a)-(d) or (f).					
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		J						
	1. Certified copies of the priority docu	ıments have b	een received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
	application from the International E	Bureau (PCT F	ule 17.2(a)).						
* 5	see the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the ce	rtified copies not rece	eived.					
Attachmen	t(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summ						
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	48)	Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform	nil Date nal Patent Application					
	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/23/06</u> .		6) Other:	Стопт фриосион					

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 and 18-33 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 4-7, 10, 11, 18, 21-24, 27-30, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schelling et al* (US 5,706,097) and *Nagasaki et al* (US 2002/0199149 A1).

Claims 1, 11, 28, 29, 32, and 33:

Schelling discloses a method for generating an index print (paper document) for a multimedia document storing multimedia information including video, audio, graphic, and text information. A user may select representations of the information for retrieving information of his interest. Schelling teaches identifiers (clues) that help the user to identify relevant information. Schelling teaches that users may

Application/Control Number: 10/001,849

Art Unit: 2179

print the multimedia information on a paper document (abstract; col. 1, lines 58-67; col. 2, lines 1-14, 43-67; col. 3, lines 1-25; col. 4, lines 2-7). Schelling does not teach accepting user input to identify a concept of interest and that information to be relevant to the concept of interest is annotated when printed on a page. However, Nagasaki discloses a method of recording and printing multimedia information. Nagasaki explains that a user is enabled to identify a concept of interest; the system analyzes the multimedia information to identify information relevant to the user's concept of interest; and then the multimedia information may be printed on paper to generate a paper document having the relevant information, which is annotated when printed (abstract; p. 7, par. 0162; p. 8, par. 0168; p. 9, par. 0176, 0179; p. 11, par. 0198, 0199, 0202; p. 13, par. 0221; figs. 7A, 7B, 9, 10A, 10B, 12A, 12B, 111). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schelling to include Nagasaki's teaching of accepting user input to identify a concept of interest because it provides automated analysis, content-based video browsing, and an efficient way for users to retrieve specified video data; and it would have been further obvious to modify Schelling/Nagasaki's method of generating a paper document for multimedia information including annotations because they provide the user with enhanced information that is easy and quick to identify and assimilate, it can be easily transmitted and allows production of copies in large quantities.

Claims 4 and 21:

See claim 1. Schelling/Nagasaki teaches a method of generating an index print (printable representation) for a multimedia document having multimedia information (text, audio, video), (Schelling: abstract; col. 1, lines 58-67; col. 2, lines 1-20). The method has layout information for printing the printable representation of the first and second type on a paper medium (Schelling: col. 3, lines 1-40; Nagasaki: p. 11, par. 0198).

Claims 5 and 22:

See claim 4. Schelling teaches that the topic of interest (audio, video, text, etc.) is annotated using different styles (type indicators), (figs. 1, 4, 5).

Claims 6 and 23:

See claim 1. Schelling teaches an indicator icon that indicates files containing sound and a text message describing the data file. Shelling illustrates text relating to (fig. 1) a sound recording of a person's (i.e. Grandma's) voice (col. 2, lines 62-67; col. 3, lines 10-29).

Claims 7 and 24:

See claim 6. Schelling teaches that the system analyzes the objects (text, image, etc.), retrieves and displays the information (fig. 1; col. 2, lines 43-67; col. 3, lines 1-40; col. 4, lines 57-67; col. 5, lines 1-14).

Claims 10 and 27:

See claim 7. Schelling/Nagasaki teaches an index print having video frames extracted from video content and text information extracted from audio content (Nagasaki: figs. 7B and 106).

Claim 18:

See claim 1. Schelling teaches a computer system having a processor, display, and memory (figs. 2 and 3; col. 3, lines 40.67; col. 4, lines 1.7).

Claim 30:

See claim 1. Schelling teaches an indicator icon that indicates files containing sound and a text message describing the data file. Shelling illustrates text relating to (fig. 1) a sound recording (audio information) of a person's (i.e. Grandma's) voice (col. 2, lines 62-67; col. 3, lines 10-29).

4. Claims 2, 3, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schelling/Nagasaki* and *Nielsen et al* (US 6,055,542).

Claims 2 and 19:

See claim 1. Schelling/Nagasaki does not teach that user input identifying a concept of interest is stored in a user profile. However, Nielsen discloses a system and method for allowing a user to create an interest profile for finding information of interest within a document. Nielsen explains that once the profile is created, it

may be used on any document or web page to sort the information on the page according to the user's interests; once sorted, the information is displayed to the user (Schelling: abstract; col. 1, lines 59-67; col. 2, lines 10-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schelling/Nagasaki's system of retrieving and displaying information to include Nielsen's teaching of creating an interest profile because as Nielsen explains, it allows the user to view the points of interest without having to search an entire document.

Claims 3 and 20:

See claim 1. Schelling/Nagasaki teaches printing a matter descriptor such as a title identifying the subject matter of the data file (Schelling: col. 5, lines 1-3). Schelling/ Nagasaki does not teach a relevance indicator for indicating a degree of relevance of the multimedia information. However, Nielsen teaches an interest profile that can include additional data such as relative importance (weights); points of interest are sorted according to relevancy and are presented into the document as links (abstract; col. 1, lines 50-67; col. 2,lines 1-9). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of invention to include Nielsen's teaching of indicating a degree of relevancy in Schelling/Nagasaki's multimedia document because as Nielsen says, it allows the user to quickly spot the areas of interest within a document and move to a desired point of interest within

Application/Control Number: 10/001,849

Art Unit: 2179

the document or page (col. 4, lines 57-67; col. 5, lines 13-14).

5. Claims 8, 9, 25, 26, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schelling/Nagasaki* and *Gibbon et al* (US 6,098,082).

Claims 8, 9, 25, and 26:

See claim 1. Schelling does not teach that the multimedia document includes printed closed caption text information. However, Gibbon discloses a method for providing a compressed rendition of a video program in a format suitable for electronic searching and retrieval on the WWW. Gibbon teaches pictorial transcripts that are compact representations of video programs which are automatically generated by selecting representative frames or images from the video program and combining them with a second media component such as audio or text, which is associated with each representative frame (abstract; col. 1, lines 55-67; col. 2, lines 1-15; col. 3, lines 10-15). Gibbon teaches that a printed rendition of closed-captioned text may be provided. The printed rendition is a pictorial transcript in which each representative frame is printed with a caption containing the portion of the closed-caption text corresponding to the scene from which the representative frame is taken (col. 3, lines 16.22). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Schilling to include Gibbon's teaching of printing closed-caption text because it

provides a printable visual presentation of the sound associated with the image (frame) of interest; therefore, close captioning is not only visible on a TV receiver designed to display it but it is also visible when being printed on paper.

Claim 31:

See claim 8. Gibbon teaches that a printed rendition of closed-captioned text may be provided. The printed rendition is a pictorial transcript in which each representative frame is printed with a caption containing the portion of the closed-caption text corresponding to the scene from which the representative frame is taken (col. 3, lines 16-22).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to X. L. Bautista whose telephone number is (571) 272-4132. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 8:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2179

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

X. L. Bautista Primary Examiner Art Unit 2179

xlb September 15, 2006